REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.)   Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 15, and 23. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-18 and 20-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Faccin, *et al.* (US Publication No. 2001/0049790). Regarding the Examiner's rejection, the Applicant further appreciates the Examiner Interview held on March 31. As discussed during the Interview, the present invention deals with a novel and unobvious invention for determining whether an implicit authentication can be performed between a Multimedia domain and an user equipment based on the previous explicit authentication that was already performed between the user equipment and a serving access network. Accordingly, rather than a particular user performing separate authentications with an access network and a Multimedia domain, the present invention instead allows the Multimedia domain to perform an implicit authentication with the user equipment by "re-using the authentication data" stored during the access network authentication process.

Accordingly, amended independent Claim 15 now recites that an user equipment is first authenticated with a subscriber server in the access network allowing the user equipment to gain access to the access network. In order to then register the user equipment with the Multimedia domain, it is first decided whether an implicit authentication between the user and a S-CSCF of the Multimedia domain can take place based on the first authentication of the user equipment in the access network. In response to an affirmative decision, the S-CSCF is instructed to perform an implicit authentication by re-using the authentication data stored in the network access' subscriber server and to not perform any explicit authentication between the S-CSCF and the user equipment. On the other hand, in response to a negative decision, an

authentication challenge message is issued from the S-CSCF to the user equipment in order to perform an explicit authentication. The support for selectively performing an implicit or explicit authentication as described above can be found throughout the present application, including on Page 17 wherein it states that the decision to allow implicit authentication can be based on whether the access network and the Multimedia domain are secured and trusted by each other (i.e., they belong to the same operator).

As discussed during the Interview, such steps of determining whether an implicit authentication can be performed between the user and the Multimedia domain and selectively instructing the S-CSCF to perform an implicit or explicit authentication based on that determination are not anticipated or render obvious by the cited reference. In that regard, the Applicant submits that Faccin merely talks about a visited network contacting a HSS in the roaming subscriber's home network in order to fetch the subscriber's profile (Faccin, page 1, para 7). The subscriber profile is then used by the visited network to provide different levels or types of connectivity to the subscriber. For example, such subscriber profile may indicate different bandwidths, QoS, or services to be provided. However, nothing in Faccin shows the steps of determining whether an implicit or explicit authentication between the Multimedia domain and the user equipment can be performed. As a result, the Applicant submits that independent Claim 15 and its dependent claims are now patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits that remaining independent Claims 1, 10, and 23 have also been amended to recite similar limitations as set forth above. Accordingly, for at least similar reasons as above, independent Claims 1, 10, and 23 and their dependent Claims are also in Condition for Allowance.

3.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 4, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faccin, *et al.*. Claims 4, 14, and 19 are now depend from now allowance independent Claims 1, 10 and 15, respectively and recite further limitations in combination thereof. Therefore, the allowance of claims 4, 14, and 19 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Han,Reg#41403/

John C. Han
Registration No. 41,403

Date: April 14, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686
john.han@ericsson.com